

Weekly Compilation of
**Presidential
Documents**



Monday, June 11, 2007
Volume 43—Number 23
Pages 739–771

Contents

Addresses and Remarks

See also Meetings With Foreign Leaders
Czech Republic, Democracy and Security
Conference in Prague—744
Radio addresses—739, 767

Communications to Congress

Kingpin Act, letter transmitting designations—
739

Communications to Federal Agencies

Suspension of Limitations Under the
Jerusalem Embassy Act, memorandum—
739
Partial Resumption of Travel to Lebanon To
Promote Peace and Security,
memorandum—750

Interviews With the News Media

Exchanges with reporters in Heiligendamm,
Germany—760, 763
Interview with members of the White House
press pool in Heiligendamm, Germany—
750

Meetings With Foreign Leaders

Czech Republic, President Klaus and Prime
Minister Topolánek—741
Germany, Chancellor Merkel—759
Japan, Prime Minister Abe—759
Poland, President Kaczyński—764
Russia, President Putin—763
United Kingdom, Prime Minister Blair—760

Proclamations

Flag Day and National Flag Week—749

Statements by the President

Deaths
Senator Craig L. Thomas—749
William C. France, Jr.—749
Stem cell research legislation, House of
Representatives action—764

Supplementary Materials

Acts approved by the President—771
Checklist of White House press releases—771
Digest of other White House
announcements—768
Nominations submitted to the Senate—770

Editor's Note: The President was in Rome, Italy, on June 8, the closing date of this issue. Releases and announcements issued by the Office of the Press Secretary but not received in time for inclusion in this issue will be printed next week.

WEEKLY COMPILATION OF

PRESIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS

Published every Monday by the Office of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Administration, Washington, DC 20408, the *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* contains statements, messages, and other Presidential materials released by the White House during the preceding week.

The *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* is published pursuant to the authority contained in the Federal Register Act (49 Stat. 500, as amended; 44 U.S.C. Ch. 15), under regulations prescribed by the Administrative Committee of the Federal Register, approved by the President (37 FR 23607; 1 CFR Part 10).

Distribution is made only by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402. The *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* will be furnished by mail to domestic subscribers for \$80.00 per year (\$137.00 for mailing first class) and to foreign subscribers for \$93.75 per year, payable to the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402. The charge for a single copy is \$3.00 (\$3.75 for foreign mailing).

The *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* is also available on the Internet on the GPO Access service at <http://www.gpoaccess.gov/wcomp/index.html>.

There are no restrictions on the republication of material appearing in the *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents*.

US GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS
Washington DC 20402

OFFICIAL BUSINESS
Penalty for private use, \$300

PRESORTED STANDARD
POSTAGE & FEES PAID
GPO
PERMIT NO. G-26

Week Ending Friday, June 8, 2007

**Memorandum on Suspension of
Limitations Under the Jerusalem
Embassy Act**

June 1, 2007

Presidential Determination No. 2007-21

Memorandum for the Secretary of State

Subject: Suspension of Limitations Under the
Jerusalem Embassy Act

Pursuant to the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States, including section 7(a) of the Jerusalem Embassy Act of 1995 (Public Law 104-45) (the “Act”), I hereby determine that it is necessary to protect the national security interests of the United States to suspend for a period of 6 months the limitations set forth in sections 3(b) and 7(b) of the Act. My Administration remains committed to beginning the process of moving our Embassy to Jerusalem.

You are hereby authorized and directed to transmit this determination to the Congress, accompanied by a report in accordance with section 7(a) of the Act, and to publish the determination in the *Federal Register*.

This suspension shall take effect after transmission of this determination and report to the Congress.

George W. Bush

NOTE: This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

**Letter to Congressional Leaders
Transmitting Designations Under
the Kingpin Act**

June 1, 2007

Dear _____:

This report to the Congress, under section 804(b) of the Foreign Narcotics Kingpin Designation Act, 21 U.S.C. 1901-1908 (the

“Kingpin Act”), transmits my designations of the following five foreign persons and one foreign entity for sanctions under the Kingpin Act and reports my direction of sanctions against them under that Act:

Victor Emilio Cazarez Salazar
Gulf Cartel
Jorge Mario Paredes Cordova
Haji Azizullah Alizai
Shahbaz Khan
Frederik Heinz Barth
Sincerely,

George W. Bush

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to John D. Rockefeller IV, chairman, Senate Select Committee on Intelligence; Patrick J. Leahy, chairman, Senate Committee on the Judiciary; Joseph R. Biden, Jr., chairman, Senate Committee on Foreign Relations; Carl Levin, chairman, Senate Committee on Armed Services; Max S. Baucus, chairman, Senate Committee on Finance; Joseph I. Lieberman, chairman, Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs; Silvestre Reyes, chairman, House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence; John Conyers, Jr., chairman, House Committee on the Judiciary; Thomas P. Lantos, chairman, House Committee on Foreign Affairs; Isaac N. Skelton IV, chairman, House Committee on Armed Services; Charles B. Rangel, chairman, House Committee on Ways and Means; Bennie G. Thompson, chairman, House Committee on Homeland Security. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

The President’s Radio Address

June 2, 2007

Good morning. Next week, I will travel to Europe to attend the G-8 summit. At this meeting, the leaders of industrialized nations will discuss ways we can work together to advance trade, fight disease, promote development that works, increase access to education, and address the long-term challenge of global climate change.

It is in America's interests to help these efforts succeed. When we help lift societies out of poverty, we create new markets for American goods and new jobs for American workers. When we help reduce chaos and suffering, we make America safer, because prosperous nations are less likely to breed violence and export terror. And this week, my administration took several important steps to advance peace and opportunity across the world.

On Tuesday, America took new actions to address the ongoing genocide in Darfur. On my orders, the Department of Treasury tightened our existing economic sanctions against Sudan and imposed additional ones. I also directed Secretary Rice to work with our allies on a new U.N. Security Council resolution that will seek to impose new sanctions, expand the arms embargo, and prohibit Sudan's Government from conducting offensive military flights over this troubled region. The people of Darfur have suffered long enough. We will not avert our eyes from a crisis that challenges the conscience of the world.

On Wednesday, the United States demonstrated leadership on another crisis affecting Africa: HIV/AIDS. In 2003, my administration launched a \$15 billion Emergency Plan for AIDS relief, and that plan has supported treatment for more than 1 million people. This is a good start, but only a start. So I've asked Congress to double our initial commitment for HIV/AIDS prevention to \$30 billion over the next 5 years. By making this commitment now, we will help deliver lifesaving treatment, prevent new infections, and support care for millions of people across Africa.

As we fight violence and disease, America is also using its influence to help struggling countries transform themselves into free and hopeful societies. And on Thursday, I announced three new initiatives that will help the developing world.

The first initiative is a new project called the African Financial Sector Initiative. This initiative will help bring African nations the technical assistance they need to strengthen their financial markets. And it will encourage the international financial community to create several new private equity funds that will mobilize up to \$1 billion of new private in-

vestment in Africa. By taking these steps, we can help African entrepreneurs access capital, so they can grow their businesses and create jobs across the continent.

The second initiative is a new effort to help more of the world's poorest children get an education. In 2002, my administration launched the Africa Education Initiative, which has provided about \$300 million to improve educational opportunities throughout that continent. Now, with the support of Congress, we will devote an additional \$525 million over the next 5 years to help provide a quality basic education for up to 4 million children in poor nations. With this initiative, we will help young people get the skills they need to succeed and a chance to achieve their dreams.

The third initiative is a proposal to help developing nations meet their growing energy needs while protecting the environment and addressing the challenge of global climate change. Under my proposal, by the end of next year, America and other nations will set a long-term global goal for reducing greenhouse gases. And to meet this goal, we must help developing countries harness the power of technology. The United States is investing billions of dollars in clean energy technologies and coming up with new ways to share these technologies with other nations. Through the spirit of innovation, we will help developing nations grow their economies and be responsible stewards of the environment.

In all these endeavors, the American people can be proud of our global leadership and generosity. Our Nation is delivering aid and comfort to those in need. We're helping expand opportunity across the world. We're laying the foundation for a more peaceful and hopeful future for all our citizens.

Thank you for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 7 a.m. on June 1 in the Cabinet Room at the White House for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on June 2. The transcript was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary on June 1 but was embargoed for release until the broadcast. The Office of the Press Secretary also released a Spanish language transcript of this address.

Remarks Following Discussions With President Vaclav Klaus and Prime Minister Mirek Topolánek of the Czech Republic in Prague, Czech Republic

June 5, 2007

President Klaus. Ladies and gentlemen, unusually, there are three of us here, but our meetings took on a platform of the Prime Minister of the Czech Republic participating. And what we wanted to show by that was that with regard to the United States, the opinions of the President of the Republic and of the Prime Minister are identical. This was to demonstrate that.

We are happy about this is the second time we can welcome here the American President in the course of his office. He is the first American President to be here for a second time in his term. And we are also happy about he is actually starting his visit to Europe here.

We regard his visit as a confirmation of a traditional friendship between the Czech Republic and the United States, a friendship that has always been confirmed in the key moments of the previous century—in 1918, in 1945, and in 1989. We very much appreciate the U.S. friendship. There are things to follow up on, and I suppose this visit has brought new, enriching aspects to our friendship.

We've exchanged information on the situation in our respective countries and on the situation throughout the world. We are aware of the fact that the U.S. is highly responsible for the world's development at the moment, and I would like to emphasize that President Bush and the U.S. enjoys the support of the Czech Republic in that regard. We clearly demonstrate that in our participation in missions in Afghanistan, Iraq, Kosovo, et cetera.

We also talked about the stationing of the U.S. military facility in this country and in the neighboring country of Poland. And I think we've understood—we agree with President Bush on that. We regarded as important about President Bush has promised to make maximum efforts to explain these issues to Russia and President Putin. We have pointed it out to our guest that it is very important that we win maximum sup-

port for this project of the Czech public, who are very sensitive to those issues, and I suppose that this is what President Bush clearly realizes.

We've also exchanged views on the European integration process, and we've assured Mr. President that both myself and the Government of the Czech Republic—the matter is that the U.S. must not be regarded as a competitor of Europe. We really are not involved in creating a united Europe as a certain counterbalance to the U.S. This is not our goal. We really care about a strong transatlantic relationship, relationship between the Czech Republic and the U.S.

We are aware of the fact that our bilateral relationship is seamless. And we have emphasized to the President that the solution of the visa waiver issue would certainly help that to be regarded that way throughout our country.

May I thank again President Bush for his short, but very busy visit to the Czech Republic and for his very open and friendly dialog we've engaged in. Thank you, Mr. President.

President Bush. Laura and I are really pleased to be back in this magnificent city. As the President noted, I had the honor of being here once before during my Presidency. We had a great stay then, and I'm really looking forward to my time here.

It's beginning an important trip to Europe. Obviously, I'm off to the G-8 later on this evening. I think it's important for the people of the Czech Republic to know, however, that my first stop is here. And the reason why is because the people of the United States marvel at the great strength of character that the people of the Czech Republic have shown, your great desire for freedom. People in this country took risk necessary so that the people could actually live in a free society.

And, Mr. President, we're honored to call you friend. We appreciate very much our relationship—our bilateral relationship and our relationship in the transatlantic community. I thank you very much for being strong allies, Mr. Prime Minister and Mr. President, against extremists and radicals who would deny others the chance to live in a free society.

We live in a world in which there are ideologically driven people who murder the innocent in order to achieve their strategic objectives. And I thank the Czech Government, as well as the people of this important country, for their steadfast refusal to allow the extremists to intimidate, allow the extremists to undermine young democracies.

I appreciate so very much the fact that you have put troops in harm's way in Iraq and Afghanistan. I expressed my deepest sympathies to the families who have lost a loved one. I would hope that those families understand, the cause is noble and just and necessary for peace for the long term.

I appreciate very much the fact that the Czech Republic supported our Fund for Democracy. One of the first countries to step up was the Czech Republic, under the leadership of the President. When given a chance to help others realize the blessings of a free society, this important country stood up and said, "We want to work together with others to bring the blessings of liberty to those who have not had it."

I want to thank very much the Government for stepping up and supporting those who have—don't have an opportunity to speak for themselves, whether it be the dissidents in Belarus or in Cuba. I find it inspiring to be in a country where the leadership and the people are willing to say, "We listen carefully for the voices of those who have been imprisoned. We care deeply about human rights and human dignity not only in our own country but worldwide." I am in such a country. And so, Mr. President and Mr. Prime Minister, I'm proud to stand with you here.

We talked a lot about our mutual concerns. There's no greater issue for the people of the Czech Republic than visa waiver. I understand the issue well. I understand why people of this country would say, "Here we are, sacrificing along with the United States in Afghanistan and Iraq, yet our people don't have the same visa rights as other countries that might not be so supportive in the effort against the extremists." I see that contradiction, and therefore, I'm a strong supporter in changing our visa waiver policy. I will work with Congress to come up with a policy that, of course, meets our needs, security needs,

for example, but also treats the people of the Czech Republic with respect and who listens to those cries.

I know this is a frustrating issue for your leadership. People in the Czech Republic say, "Get it done now. We're tired of waiting." I know that, Mr. President. I just want to assure you I'll work as hard as I possibly can. We're involved in a very important immigration debate here—in the United States now—and the visa waiver is a part of this important dialog. And the only thing I can do is to assure the people I'll work with Congress to get something done in a constructive fashion.

And then, of course, we discussed the missile defense issue. Let me first talk about a general principle when it comes to relations with Russia. The cold war is over; it ended. The people of the Czech Republic don't have to choose between being a friend to the United States or a friend with Russia. You can be both. We don't believe in a zero-sum world. We don't believe that one should force a country to choose. We believe, as a matter of fact, when we work together, we can achieve important objectives.

One objective is to safeguard free nations from the possibility of a missile attack launched from a rogue regime. That's a true threat to peace. As I've told President Putin, Russia is not our enemy. The enemy of a free society such as ours would be a radical or extremists or a rogue regime trying to blackmail the free world in order to promote its ideological objectives. And so my attitude on missile defense is, is that this is a purely—it's not my attitude; it's the truth—it's a purely defensive measure, aimed not at Russia but at true threats.

And therefore, as the President mentioned, I look forward to having conversations with President Putin, not only at the G-8 but in the United States when he comes over. And my message will be, Vladimir—I call him Vladimir—that you shouldn't fear a missile defense system. As a matter of fact, why don't you cooperate with us on a missile defense system? Why don't you participate with the United States? Please send your generals over to see how such a system would work. Send your scientists. Let us have the ability to discuss this issue in an open forum

where we'll be completely transparent. And I'll remind him that we're having these discussions not only bilaterally with the Czech Republic and Poland but also through the context of NATO, that the missile defense system will be coordinated with NATO.

And so I just want the people of this important country to understand that our intention is—and the reality is, is that we'll protect ourselves from the true threat. It seems like to me, it's in this country's interest to work cooperatively with the latest technologies to provide protection not only for themselves but for others. It's a noble gesture and an important gesture. And I'll tell Russia that they need not fear such a system, that Russia is—with whom we'd like to have positive relations. That's a complex relationship, no doubt. But there's a lot of areas where we can work together to deal with common threats. And that will be my message, Mr. President, to President Putin, not only in Germany but when he comes to visit me in the United States.

We had a really important and interesting discussion. We discussed a lot of important issues. That's what you should expect friends to do. I'm convinced that this relationship is really good for the United States of America and will continue to work to foster good relations.

Mr. President and Mr. Prime Minister, thank you for your hospitality. I thank you for your important discussions, and thanks for giving me a chance to discuss these issues with the media.

Prime Minister Topolánek. Mr. honored President, I'm very happy that this meeting has taken place, and I will repeat what Mr. President Klaus said—I'm very happy that this meeting took place in this format. It appears that after a long time, the foreign policy of the Czech Republic goes in the same direction; it is coordinated; we are pulling in one direction. That's good news not only for the U.S.; that's good news primarily for the people in this country.

This visit has confirmed that there are no major problems—no problems, I should say, between our two countries. On the contrary, the U.S. and the Czech Republic share the same values. Although each of those countries has a different size and, as a result, car-

ries a different portion of responsibility, we need to say that is the same kind of responsibility. That's why we coparticipate in peace missions; we are involved in combating terrorism; we want to be involved in collective defense by building the missile defense system in the Czech Republic and in Poland.

I would like to emphasize that the cooperation with the U.S. does not concern only security issues, human rights issues, et cetera, and peacekeeping missions, et cetera. This is what the media has been paying most attention to. The U.S. is not only our major ally, but it is one of the major investors in the Czech Republic. Apart from that, we are after business cooperation, technology cooperation. The U.S. is the world's innovation leader. It is dominant in science. And maybe this is our condition—and I may be of putting this in a light at all—this may be our condition for the installation of the radar facility in the Czech Republic. We want cooperation in science technology and innovation. This is what we regard as very important, not only for the missile defense itself but for the Czech Republic and the U.S., as such.

I want to say that the point is not only to site the facility in the Czech Republic, but this is about the joint will for defense of freedom. And I think the Czechs are much more sensitive to that than many other European nations. That's why we want to be involved. And we want to shift the collective defense not only to the Czech Republic but also to make sure it stretches over other friends in Europe.

In response to media speculation, I would like to say that neither me nor the American President link the siting of the radar facility to the visa waiver issue. Visa is unjust; it must be done away with. We've started discussing this much earlier than we started the radar facility talks. I trust President Bush and his clear promise that he will advocate the waiver of the visa, and talking about a bargain is, I think, rather undignified in this regard. We would be involved in visa talks even without the radar. And on the contrary, we would want to help our allies, protect our allies against a rogue state's rockets, even if there was no visa problem. These topics are inter-related only because we are the Czech Republic and they are the U.S.; otherwise, not.

We didn't discuss these issues only; we talked about human rights in Cuba, in Belarus, and our support of the opposition there. We talked about Southern Ossetia, Abkhazia, and Transdnestria conflicts. We talked about Kosovo, about our missions to Afghanistan. We talked about energy security. All those are interrelated issues. We talked also about a number of other issues. We need to talk about such issues, and I'm happy that in a crushing majority of issues, rather in all issues, we could find agreement with the American President.

There are a lot of things that we could not discuss, and I hope we will be able to discuss them during my visit to the U.S. that is now being prepared.

If I were to pick two words from George Walker Bush today that characterize our cooperation and friendship, I would call it active partnership. Thank you.

President Klaus. Thank you, honored President. Thank you, Prime Minister. And let me bring this conference closed. Thank you, and have a good day.

NOTE: The President spoke at approximately 11:50 a.m. in Rothmayer Hall at Prague Castle. In his remarks, he referred to President Vladimir Putin of Russia. President Klaus and Prime Minister Topolánek spoke in Czech, and their remarks were translated by an interpreter. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks to the Democracy and Security Conference in Prague

June 5, 2007

Thank you all. President Ilves, Foreign Minister Schwarzenberg, distinguished guests: Laura and I are pleased to be back in Prague, and we appreciate the gracious welcome in this historic hall. Tomorrow I'll attend the G-8 summit, where I will meet with the leaders of the world's most powerful economies. This afternoon I stand with men and women who represent an even greater power: the power of human conscience.

In this room are dissidents and democratic activists from 17 countries on five continents. You follow different traditions; you practice different faiths; and you face different chal-

lenges. But you are united by an unwavering conviction: That freedom is the non-negotiable right of every man, woman, and child, and that the path to lasting peace in our world is liberty.

This conference was conceived by three of the great advocates for freedom in our time: Jose Maria Aznar, Vaclav Havel, and Natan Sharansky. I thank them for the invitation to address this inspiring assembly and for showing the world that an individual with moral clarity and courage can change the course of history.

It is fitting that we meet in the Czech Republic, a nation at the heart of Europe and of the struggle for freedom on this continent. Nine decades ago, Tomas Masaryk proclaimed Czechoslovakia's independence based on the "ideals of modern democracy." That democracy was interrupted, first by the Nazis and then by the Communists, who seized power in a shameful coup that left the Foreign Minister dead in the courtyard of this palace.

Through the long darkness of the Soviet occupation, the true face of this nation was never in doubt. The world saw it in the reforms of the Prague Spring and the principled demands of Charter 77. Those efforts were met with tanks and truncheons and arrests by secret police. But the violent would not have the final word. In 1989, thousands gathered in Wenceslas Square to call for their freedom. Theaters like Magic Lantern became headquarters for dissidents. Workers left their factories to support a strike. And within weeks, the regime crumbled. Vaclav Havel went from prisoner of state to head of state. And the people of Czechoslovakia brought down the Iron Curtain with a Velvet Revolution.

Across Europe, similar scenes were unfolding. In Poland, a movement that began in a single shipyard freed people across a nation. In Hungary, mourners gathered at Heroes Square to bury a slain reformer and bury their Communist regime as well. In East Germany, families came together for prayer meetings and found the strength to tear down a wall. Soon, activists emerged from the attics and church basements to reclaim the streets of Bulgaria and Romania and Albania and Latvia and Lithuania and Estonia.

The Warsaw Pact was dissolved peacefully in this very room. And after seven decades of oppression, the Soviet Union ceased to exist.

Behind these astounding achievements was the triumph of freedom in the battle of ideas. The Communists had an imperial ideology that claimed to know the directions of history. But in the end, it was overpowered by ordinary people who wanted to live their lives and worship their God and speak the truth to their children. The Communists had the harsh rule of Brezhnev and Honecker and Ceausescu. But in the end, it was no match for the vision of Walesa and Havel, the defiance of Sakharov and Sharansky, the resolve of Reagan and Thatcher, the fearless witness of John Paul. From this experience, a clear lesson has emerged: Freedom can be resisted, and freedom can be delayed, but freedom cannot be denied.

In the years since liberation, Central and Eastern European nations have navigated the difficult transition to democracy. Leaders made the tough reforms needed to enter NATO and the European Union. Citizens claimed their freedom in the Balkans and beyond. And now, after centuries of war and suffering, the continent of Europe is at last in peace.

With this new era have come new threats to freedom. In dark and repressive corners of the world, whole generations grew up with no voice in their government and no hope in their future. This life of oppression bred deep resentment. And for many, resentment boiled over into radicalism and extremism and violence. The world saw the result on September the 11th, 2001, when terrorists based in Afghanistan sent 19 suicidal men to murder nearly 3,000 innocent people in the United States.

For some, this attack called for a narrow response. In truth, 9/11 was evidence of a much broader danger, an international movement of violent Islamic extremists that threatens free peoples everywhere. The extremists's ambition is to build a totalitarian empire that spans all current and former Muslim lands, including parts of Europe. Their strategy to achieve that goal is to frighten the world into surrender through a ruthless campaign of terrorist murder.

To confront this enemy, America and our allies have taken the offensive with the full range of our military, intelligence, and law enforcement capabilities. Yet this battle is more than a military conflict. Like the cold war, it's an ideological struggle between two fundamentally different visions of humanity. On one side are the extremists who promise paradise, but deliver a life of public beatings and repression of women and suicide bombings. On the other side are huge numbers of moderate men and women, including millions in the Muslim world, who believe that every human life has dignity and value that no power on Earth can take away.

The most powerful weapon in the struggle against extremism is not bullets or bombs; it is the universal appeal of freedom. Freedom is the design of our Maker and the longing of every soul. Freedom is the best way to unleash the creativity and economic potential of a nation. Freedom is the only ordering of a society that leads to justice. And human freedom is the only way to achieve human rights.

Expanding freedom is more than a moral imperative; it is the only realistic way to protect our people in the long run. Years ago, Andrei Sakharov warned that a country that does not respect the rights of its own people will not respond to the rights of its neighbors. History proves him right. Governments accountable to their people do not attack each other. Democracies address problems through the political process, instead of blaming outside scapegoats. Young people who can disagree openly with their leaders are less likely to adopt violent ideologies. And nations that commit to freedom for their people will not support extremists; they will join in defeating them.

For all these reasons, the United States is firmly committed to the advance of freedom and democracy as the great alternatives to repression and radicalism. We have a historic objective in view. In my second Inaugural Address, I pledged America to the ultimate goal of ending tyranny in our world. Some have said that qualifies me as a dissident President. If standing for liberty in the world makes me a dissident, I wear that title with pride.

America pursues our freedom agenda in many ways, some vocal and visible, others quiet and hidden from view. Ending tyranny requires support for the forces of conscience that undermine repressive societies from within. The Soviet dissident Andrei Amalrik compared a tyrannical state to a soldier who constantly points a gun at his enemy, until his arms finally tire and the prisoner escapes. The role of the free world is to put pressure on the arms of the world's tyrants and strengthen the prisoners who are trying to speed their collapse.

And so I meet personally with dissidents and democratic activists from some of the world's worst dictatorships, including Belarus and Burma and Cuba and North Korea, Sudan, and Zimbabwe. At this conference, I look forward to meeting other dissidents, including some from Iran and Syria. One of those dissidents is Mamoun Homsy. In 2001, this man was an independent member of the Syrian Parliament who simply issued a declaration asking the Government to begin respecting human rights. For this entirely peaceful act, he was arrested and sent to jail, where he spent several years beside other innocent advocates for a free Syria.

Another dissident I will meet here is Rebiya Kadeer of China, whose sons have been jailed in what we believe is an act of retaliation for her human rights activities. The talent of men and women like Rebiya is the greatest resource of their nations, far more valuable than the weapons of their army or their oil under the ground. America calls on every nation that stifles dissent to end its repression, to trust its people, and to grant its citizens the freedom they deserve.

There are many dissidents who couldn't join us because they are being unjustly imprisoned or held under house arrest. I look forward to the day when a conference like this one includes Alexander Kozulin of Belarus, Aung San Suu Kyi of Burma, Oscar Elias Biscet of Cuba, Father Nguyen Van Ly of Vietnam, Ayman Nour of Egypt. The daughter of one of these political prisoners is in this room. I would like to say to her and all the families, I thank you for your courage; I pray for your comfort and strength; and I call for the immediate and unconditional release of your loved ones.

In the eyes of America, the democratic dissidents today are the democratic leaders of tomorrow. So we're taking new steps to strengthen our support. We recently created a Human Rights Defenders Fund, which provides grants for the legal defense and medical expenses of activists arrested or beaten by repressive governments. I strongly support the Prague Document that your conference plans to issue, which states that "the protection of human rights is critical to international peace and security." And in keeping with the goals of that declaration, I have asked Secretary Rice to send a directive to every U.S. Ambassador in an unfree nation: Seek out and meet with activists for democracy; seek out those who demand human rights.

People living in tyranny need to know they are not forgotten. North Koreans live in a closed society where dissent is brutally suppressed, and they are cut off from their brothers and sisters to the south. The Iranians are a great people who deserve to chart their own future, but they are denied their liberty by a handful of extremists whose pursuit of nuclear weapons prevents their country from taking its rightful place amongst the thriving. The Cubans are desperate for freedom, and as that nation enters a period of transition, we must insist on free elections and free speech and free assembly. And in Sudan, freedom is denied and basic human rights are violated by a Government that pursues genocide against its own citizens. My message to all those who suffer under tyranny is this: We will never excuse your oppressors; we will always stand for your freedom.

Freedom is also under assault in countries that have shown some progress. In Venezuela, elected leaders have resorted to shallow populism to dismantle democratic institutions and tighten their grip on power. The Government of Uzbekistan continues to silence independent voices by jailing human rights activists. And Vietnam recently arrested and imprisoned a number of peaceful religious and political activists.

These developments are discouraging, but there are more reasons for optimism. At the start of the 1980s, there were only 45 democracies on Earth. There are now more than

120 democracies; more people now live in freedom than ever before. And it is the responsibility of those who enjoy the blessings of liberty to help those who are struggling to establish their free societies.

So the United States has nearly doubled funding for democracy projects. We're working with our partners in the G-8 to promote the rise of a vibrant civil society in the Middle East through initiatives like the Forum for the Future. We're cooperating side by side with the new democracies in Ukraine and Georgia and Kyrgyzstan. We congratulate the people of Yemen on their landmark presidential election and the people of Kuwait on elections in which women were able to vote and run for office for the first time. We stand firmly behind the people of Lebanon and Afghanistan and Iraq as they defend their democratic gains against extremist enemies. These people are making tremendous sacrifices for liberty. They deserve the admiration of the free world, and they deserve our unwavering support.

The United States is also using our influence to urge valued partners like Egypt and Saudi Arabia and Pakistan to move toward freedom. These nations have taken brave stands and strong action to confront extremists, along with some steps to expand liberty and transparency. Yet they have a great distance still to travel. The United States will continue to press nations like these to open up their political systems and give greater voice to their people. Inevitably, this creates tension. But our relationships with these countries are broad enough and deep enough to bear it. As our relationships with South Korea and Taiwan during the cold war prove, America can maintain a friendship and push a nation toward democracy at the same time.

We're also applying that lesson to our relationships with Russia and China. The United States has strong working relationships with these countries. Our friendship with them is complex. In the areas where we share mutual interests, we work together. In other areas, we have strong disagreements. China's leaders believe that they can continue to open the nation's economy without opening its political system. We disagree. In Russia, reforms that were once promised to empower citizens have been derailed, with troubling

implications for democratic development. Part of a good relationship is the ability to talk openly about our disagreements. So the United States will continue to build our relationships with these countries, and we will do it without abandoning our principles or our values.

We appreciate that free societies take shape at different speeds in different places. One virtue of democracy is that it reflects local history and traditions. Yet there are fundamental elements that all democracies share: freedom of speech, religion, press, and assembly; rule of law enforced by independent courts; private property rights; and political parties that compete in free and fair elections. These rights and institutions are the foundation of human dignity, and as countries find their own path to freedom, they must find a loyal partner in the United States of America.

Extending the reach of freedom is a mission that unites democracies around the world. Some of the greatest contributions are coming from nations with the freshest memories of tyranny. I appreciate the Czech Republic's support for human rights projects in Belarus and Burma and Cuba. I thank Germany and Poland and the Czech Republic and Hungary and Slovenia and Georgia, Lithuania, Estonia, Croatia for contributing to the new United Nations Democracy Fund. I'm grateful for the commitment many new democracies in Central and Eastern Europe are making to Afghanistan and Iraq. I appreciate that these countries are willing to do the hard work necessary to enable people who want to be free to live in a free society.

In all these ways, the freedom agenda is making a difference. The work has been difficult, and that is not going to change. There will be triumphs and failures, progress and setbacks. Ending tyranny cannot be achieved overnight. And of course, this objective has its critics.

Some say that ending tyranny means imposing our values on people who do not share them, or that people live in parts of the world where freedom cannot take hold. That is refuted by the fact that every time people are given a choice, they choose freedom.

We saw that when the people of Latin America turned dictatorships into democracies, when the people of South Africa replaced apartheid with a free society, and the people of Indonesia ended their long authoritarian rule. We saw it when Ukrainians in orange scarves demanded that their ballots be counted. We saw it when millions of Afghans and Iraqis defied the terrorists to elect free governments. At a polling station in Baghdad, I was struck by the words of an Iraqi. He had one leg, and he told a reporter, "I would have crawled here if I had to." When democracy—was democracy—I ask the critics, was democracy imposed on that man? Was freedom a value he did not share? The truth is that the only ones who have to impose their values are the extremists and the radicals and the tyrants.

And that is why the Communists crushed the Prague Spring and threw an innocent playwright in jail and trembled at the sight of a Polish Pope. History shows that ultimately, freedom conquers fear. And given a chance, freedom will conquer fear in every nation on Earth.

Another objection—objection is that ending tyranny will unleash chaos. Critics point to the violence in Afghanistan or Iraq or Lebanon as evidence that freedom leaves people less safe. But look who's causing the violence. It's the terrorists; it's the extremists. It is no coincidence that they are targeting young democracies in the Middle East. They know that the success of free societies there is a mortal threat to their ambitions and to their very survival. The fact that our enemies are fighting back is not a reason to doubt democracy. It is evidence that they recognize democracy's power. It is evidence that we are at war. And it is evidence that free nations must do what it takes to prevail.

Still, some argue that a safer goal would be stability, especially in the Middle East. The problem is that pursuing stability at the expense of liberty does not lead to peace; it leads to September the 11th, 2001. The policy of tolerating tyranny is a moral and strategic failure. It is a mistake the world must not repeat in the 21st century.

Others fear that democracy will bring dangerous forces to power, such as Hamas in the Palestinian Territories. Elections will not

always turn out the way we hope. Yet democracy consists of more than a single trip to the ballot box. Democracy requires meaningful opposition parties, a vibrant civil society, a government that enforces the law and responds to the needs of its people. Elections can accelerate the creation of such institutions. In a democracy, people will not vote for a life of perpetual violence. To stay in power, elected officials must listen to their people and pursue their desires for peace—or, in democracies, the voters will replace them through free elections.

Finally, there's the contention that ending tyranny is unrealistic. Well, some argue that extending democracy around the world is simply too difficult to achieve. That's nothing new. We've heard that criticism before, throughout history. At every stage of the cold war, there were those who argued that the Berlin Wall was permanent and that people behind the Iron Curtain would never overcome their oppressors. History has sent a different message.

The lesson is that freedom will always have its skeptics. But that's not the whole story. There are also people like you and the loved ones you represent, men and women with courage to risk everything for your ideals. In his first address as President, Vaclav Havel proclaimed, "People, your Government has returned to you!" He was echoing the first speech of Tomas Masaryk who was, in turn, quoting the 17th century Czech teacher Comenius. His message was that freedom is timeless. It does not belong to one government or one generation. Freedom is the dream and the right of every person in every nation in every age.

The United States of America believes deeply in that message. It was the inspiration for our founding when we declared that "all men are created equal." It was the conviction that led us to help liberate this continent and stand with the captive nations through their long struggle. It is the truth that guides our Nation to oppose radicals and extremists and terror and tyranny in the world today. And it is the reason I have such great confidence in the men and women in this room.

I leave Prague with a certainty that the cause of freedom is not tired and that its future is in the best of hands. With unbreakable

faith in the power of liberty, you will inspire your people, you will lead your nations, and you will change the world.

Thanks for having me. And may God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 4:07 p.m. in the Large Hall at Czernin Palace. In his remarks, he referred to President Toomas Ilves of Estonia; Foreign Minister Karel Schwarzenberg and former President Vaclav Havel of the Czech Republic; former Prime Minister Jose Maria Aznar of Spain; Natan Anatoly Sharansky, former Soviet dissident and author; former President Lech Walesa of Poland; and former Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher of the United Kingdom.

Statement on the Death of William C. France, Jr.

June 5, 2007

Laura and I are deeply saddened by the death of Bill France, Jr. Bill was a legend in the world of NASCAR whose passion and vision for stock car racing led the sport to the national prominence it enjoys today.

Bill brought racing's excitement to millions of new fans through his steadfast and innovative leadership. Bill also helped ensure that the NASCAR community found many ways to support the men and women of the U.S. Armed Forces. Our thoughts and prayers are with the France family.

Statement on the Death of Senator Craig L. Thomas

June 5, 2007

Laura and I are deeply saddened by the death of Wyoming Senator Craig Thomas. During nearly 23 years of public service as a Senator, Congressman, and State legislator, Senator Thomas was a tireless and effective advocate for the people of his beloved home State. He was a man of character and integrity, known for his devotion to the values he shared with the people of Wyoming. He leaves a lasting legacy as a guardian of Wyoming's lands and resources and our country's national parks. Our thoughts and prayers go out to Senator Thomas's wife, Susan, his family, and friends.

Proclamation 8155—Flag Day and National Flag Week, 2007

June 5, 2007

*By the President of the United States
of America*

A Proclamation

The American Flag represents freedom and has been an enduring symbol of our Nation's ideals since the earliest days of our Nation. Wherever it flies, we are reminded of America's unity and in the great cause of liberty and justice for all.

Two hundred and thirty years ago, the Second Continental Congress officially made the Stars and Stripes the symbol of America. The Founders declared that the 13 stars gracing the original flag represented "a new constellation," just as America embodied new hope and new light for mankind. Today, our flag continues to convey the bold spirit of a proud and determined Nation.

Americans have long flown our flag as a sign of patriotism and gratitude for the blessings of liberty. We also pledge allegiance to the flag as an expression of loyalty to our country and to the belief in the American creed of freedom and justice. By displaying and showing respect for the flag, we honor the ideals upon which our democracy rests and show appreciation for the freedoms we enjoy today. Flying the flag can also be an expression of thanks for the men and women who have served and sacrificed in defense of our freedoms—from the early patriots of the Continental Army to the courageous Americans in uniform who are defending those freedoms around the world today.

During Flag Day and National Flag Week, we honor Old Glory and reflect on the foundations of our freedom. As citizens of this great Nation, we are proud of our heritage, grateful for our liberty, and confident in our future.

To commemorate the adoption of our flag, the Congress, by joint resolution approved August 3, 1949, as amended (63 Stat. 492), designated June 14 of each year as "Flag Day" and requested that the President issue an annual proclamation calling for its observance and for the display of the flag of the United States on all Federal Government

buildings. The Congress also requested, by joint resolution approved June 9, 1966, as amended (80 Stat. 194), that the President issue annually a proclamation designating the week in which June 14 occurs as “National Flag Week” and calling upon all citizens of the United States to display the flag during that week.

Now, Therefore, I, George W. Bush, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim June 14, 2007, as Flag Day and the week beginning June 10, 2007, as National Flag Week. I direct the appropriate officials to display the flag on all Federal Government buildings during that week, and I urge all Americans to observe Flag Day and National Flag Week by flying the Stars and Stripes from their homes and other suitable places. I also call upon the people of the United States to observe with pride and all due ceremony those days from Flag Day through Independence Day, also set aside by the Congress (89 Stat. 211), as a time to honor America, to celebrate our heritage in public gatherings and activities, and to publicly recite the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this fifth day of June, in the year of our Lord two thousand seven, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and thirty-first.

George W. Bush

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 10:12 a.m., June 7, 2007]

NOTE: This proclamation was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on June 6, and it was published in the *Federal Register* on June 8.

Memorandum on Partial Resumption of Travel to Lebanon To Promote Peace and Security

June 5, 2007

Presidential Determination No. 2007–22

Memorandum for the Secretary of Transportation

Subject: Partial Resumption of Travel to Lebanon to Promote Peace and Security

By virtue of the authority vested in me by 49 U.S.C. 40106(b) and for the purpose of promoting peace and security in Lebanon, I hereby determine that the prohibition of transportation services to Lebanon established by Presidential Determination 85–14 of July 1, 1985, as amended by Presidential Determination 92–41 of August 17, 1992, and Presidential Determination 98–32 of June 19, 1998, is hereby further amended to permit U.S. air carriers under contract to the United States Government to engage in foreign air transportation to and from Lebanon of passengers, including U.S. and non-U.S. citizens, and their accompanying baggage; of goods for humanitarian purposes; and of any other cargo or materiel.

All other prohibitions set forth in the above-referenced Presidential determinations remain in effect.

You are directed to implement this determination immediately.

You are authorized and directed to publish this determination in the *Federal Register*.

George W. Bush

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 8:45 a.m., June 7, 2007]

NOTE: This memorandum was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on June 6, and it was published in the *Federal Register* on June 8.

Interview With Members of the White House Press Pool in Heiligendamm, Germany

June 6, 2007

The President. Let me start off by talking about my speech yesterday. The purpose of the speech is to remind our allies and those

who are wondering as to whether or not the United States is firmly committed to democracy that we are. I strongly believe that we are in a war with a group of ideologues and that we can eventually win this war by promoting an alternative ideology.

And so the speech yesterday was to speak clearly to people around the world that the United States is committed to this freedom agenda, that there is a realistic reason why we promote freedom, that it's for our own security. There's a moral imperative to promote freedom, and that is to recognize that there are people who live in societies that are still repressive and that free nations have an obligation to work to secure their liberty. I made it very clear that democracy takes time, that it takes different forms in different places, but nevertheless, there are underlying principles which are essential to free societies.

I pointed out that freedom has made great progress over 20 years. The reason I did that was, one, to express my optimism about the future, but, two, make it clear that things—the freedom agenda just doesn't bloom overnight; it takes hard work, but I also made it clear it's necessary work. And then, as you know, I went around the world and talked about different spots around the world.

And I think it's very important for the G-8—nations in the G-8 to recognize the power of liberty to transform societies. And so I'll be talking, of course, about that here. I think it's important for nations that are free to recognize they have an obligation to help others. I was moved by the people I met. It was just very heartwarming to meet with heroic souls that do have the capacity, with proper support, of changing their societies and, therefore, changing the world.

Anyway, it was an important speech to give. It's always important for the American President to keep setting an agenda based upon values. And those of you who followed me know full well that I believe that liberty has transformed Europe, liberty has transformed the Far East, and I believe liberty can transform the Middle East. And I'm determined to advance that cause.

Here at the G-8, there's obviously a variety of subjects. One, it's going to be very important for us to continue to discuss climate

change in a way that actually accomplishes an objective, which is the reduction of greenhouse gases over time and the advancement of technologies, which will yield to better environmental policy as well as energy security.

The United States can serve as a bridge between some nations who believe that now is the time to come up with a set goal, as well as a—I said, the remedy, and those who are reluctant to participate in the dialog. So I laid out an agenda that can move the process forward within the framework of the United Nations, that, in essence, says that we'll be setting a goal at the end of 2008—that “we” being the major emitters—within the framework of the U.N. In other words, this will fold into the U.N. framework. And that enables us to get China and India at the table to discuss how we can all move forward together.

Secondly, in my speech, I said we'll come up with our own policies to meet an interim goal for our country as well as a national goal—or international goal for the rest of the world. And I'll be talking to Angela about that at lunch. I think it fits into her desires to see the process move forward. One of the concerns was, is that there would not be a constructive result of this meeting that basically announced that there should be a post-Kyoto framework. And we will achieve that objective here at the G-8 because we will have set a post-Kyoto framework.

This is an important subject. I also hope we spend an equal amount of time on HIV/AIDS on the continent of Africa or reducing malaria on the continent of Africa or helping feed the hungry. So it's a—and finally, it's going to be important for us to continue to discuss vital cooperation on fighting extremists and radicals who still pose a threat to our respective nations. The temptation is to sit back and say, well, maybe they're not dangerous anymore because they haven't launched an attack on our respective homelands. They are dangerous. They do want to attack. And the best way to deal with it is to work closely together.

Anyway, I'm looking forward to this. It's obviously a lovely spot. I've been here before. I think some of you came with me—nice and relaxing. Went for a good, hour bike ride today with a couple of Secret Service agents

and some German police, got out in the woods and charged around. Felt pretty good about it.

Q. Can we ask some questions?

The President. No. That's all I wanted to tell you. Go on home. [Laughter] I feel so good about life; I'm not going to answer questions. [Laughter] No—yes, you can, please. Please ask a few.

Missile Defense System/Russia-U.S. Relations

Q. What kind of military response would the United States take if Russia retargeted its missiles on Europe, as President Putin has threatened?

The President. As I said yesterday, that Russia is not an enemy. There needs to be no military response because we're not at war with Russia.

You know, my first meeting with Vladimir Putin, I told him, I said, what we need to do is get the cold war behind us and work constructively on how to deal with the threats of the 21st century. Russia is not a threat. Nor is the missile defense we're proposing a threat to Russia. So I'm going to talk to Vladimir about that. I've already talked to him about it once on the telephone. I sent Bob Gates to talk to him. And we'll have a good dialog about how we can constructively work together to deal with—modernize our capacity to deal with the threat to the—the true threats.

So I don't see any military response needed. Russia is not going to attack Europe. The missile defense system is not aimed at Russia. As a matter of fact, I believe it would be in Russia's interest to participate with us, and have made that offer and will continue to make the offer.

Q. Do you take that threat seriously, though?

The President. I don't think Vladimir Putin intends to attack Russia—I mean, Europe. So I'll talk to him about it, but it's—if he's saying, "The missile defense system is a threat to us," our—the need, therefore, is to make clear there is not.

By the way, a missile defense system that is deployed in Europe can handle one or two rocket launchers. It can't handle a multiple launch regime. Russia has got an inventory

that could overpower any missile defense system. The practicality is, is that this aimed at a country like Iran, if they ended up with a nuclear weapon, so that they couldn't blackmail the free world.

Q. What do you make of his motivation for all—

The President. I haven't had a chance to talk to him about it. I'm going to.

Q. Right, and say, this is just some sort of misunderstanding that he doesn't—you don't see any political purpose behind what he's doing?

The President. For his own sake inside his country? I'm not sure. I haven't had a chance to visit with him about that. As you know, I've got a visit here, and then I'll visit with him in Maine.

Kosovo/United Nations Security Council

Q. Do you think it might be an effort to obtain bargaining chips for negotiating over other issues, like Kosovo?

The President. I talked to him about Kosovo the other day, and I don't recall missile defense coming up. In other words, it wasn't a quid pro quo. So—he's got deep concerns about Kosovo, and so do we. It's an issue that we're just going to have to continue to work with him on. We believe we ought to move the Ahtisaari plan forward through the United Nations, and he's got reservations about it.

Democracy in Russia

Q. Gary Kasparov, who you met with yesterday, has said that Russia is now a police state, and he said the West should stop giving Putin democratic credentials. What do you—

The President. I think there are—as I said yesterday, society has advanced a long way from the old Soviet era. There is a growing middle class; there is prosperity; there's elections. It's interesting you would ask the question, do you think he is trying to position himself at home—thereby meaning that he is concerned about public opinion, which is a sign that there is a—when public opinion influences leadership, it is an indication that there is involvement of the people. I think what you're referring to is the upcoming elections, is he trying to say something about

the upcoming elections. I, frankly, haven't talked to him about that aspect. But if, in fact, he is concerned about the upcoming elections, it does say something about the state of the political scene in Russia.

And as I said yesterday, we've got a friendship with Russia, and there is a lot of common interest in Russia. But I expressed concerns about what were Western expectations and what has now happened inside Russia—for example, rule of law or some press decisions he's made. I've had these discussions with Vladimir, frankly, over my time as President. I remember our meeting in Slovakia. It was a good, frank discussion about decisions he's made, and he asked me about decisions I made.

Now, the fundamental question is, does it make sense to have relations with Russia? I think it does. Do we agree on everything? No, we don't. Are there areas where we can work together? You bet. And that's why I call it a complex relationship.

Same issue with China. China has got a—we've got an economic interest in China. We've got interest with China in working with North Korea, just like we have with Russia. And yet we disagree with China's reluctance to advance the democratic process.

International Cooperation on the Environment/Climate Change

Q. On the issue of climate change, are you frustrated at always being portrayed as the odd man out? And what do you make of the portrayals of the U.S. trying to upstage Merkel with your climate announcement last week?

The President. Well, Angela Merkel and I have had a lot of discussions about this issue. And as I told you, she was interested in whether or not there should be a—whether or not we agree there ought to be a post-Kyoto framework. And my announcement clearly said there should be one and that the United States will be directly involved in developing that framework.

I've got a very substantial record when it comes to advancing technologies to make the air cleaner in the United States. We've actually had a reduction of greenhouse gases and—in spite of the fact that our economy grew. In other words, it's hard to reduce

greenhouse gases in the face of economic growth, but we were able to do so. We've laid out a substantial initiative when it comes to tailpipe emissions, and that is the reduction of our usage of gasoline by 20 percent over a 10-year period. So I'm looking forward to telling people exactly what we've done here in the United States.

Q. Will you give any ground on the two-degree target that she wants?

The President. No, I talked about what I'm for. Remember? I said I'm for sitting together with the nations to sit down and discuss a way forward. I think when people really look at what I've said, they say, well, that's an interesting way to bridge the difference between what China has said, for example, and what others in Europe have said. And in order for there to be—first of all, you're not going to have greenhouse gas emissions that mean anything unless all nations, all emitters are at the table. And if China is not a part of the process, we all can make major strides and yet there won't be a reduction until China and India are participants. And what I have said is, here's a way to get China and India at the table.

Pakistan

Q. Can I go back to your democracy speech?

The President. Yes. Did you like it?

Q. I loved it.

The President. Thank you. Say that in your stories.

Q. I'll say it anywhere. [Laughter]

The President. What did he say?

Q. I'll say it anywhere.

The President. Okay, good. How about in print? [Laughter]

Q. Oh, well—

The President. That may be taking it too far. [Laughter]

Q. How do you square your commitment to democracy and as a priority for your foreign policy with what we're seeing in Pakistan now—major ally in the war on terror, but also a place where a core leadership of Al Qaida has found some sanctuary in tribal areas; the Government has been taking a repressive attitude toward a free press; it's got into this conflict with the judiciary, firing the chief justice. Have you had conversations

with Musharraf about democracy in his country? Do you want to see free and fair elections in Pakistan?

The President. I do, and said that in Pakistan the time I was there, standing right next to President Musharraf. And we do discuss democracy, as well as routing out foreigners in his country who are an equal threat, a threat to America and a threat to him.

It's a very—Pakistan is an important ally in this war against these extremists. As you mentioned, there are some in his country, and I'm convinced that he would like to rout them out. But it's not easy territory in which to rout people out. We've had some successes inside Pakistan, thanks to his leadership. And in terms of the democracy issues, he's going to have to deal with it. And the interesting question is, is the issue about uniform, and he addressed that at the last—only time I've been in Pakistan. He said he would seriously consider—I don't want to put words—you'll have to pull up the press conference.

Spread of Democracy

Q. But if you think democracy is the best way to confront radicals and terrorists, shouldn't we be pushing hard for democracy to really get established in Pakistan?

The President. Well, democracy is—it's a lot more established in Pakistan than some of the other nations I mentioned. And there's upcoming elections. And what you're seeing is a lot of posturing about the election process, and it's not perfect. Either was our democracy perfect for 100 years when we enslaved people.

And so it's—we do push for democracy. We push in the context of the reality on the ground as well. I mentioned Saudi Arabia. Saudi Arabia is a close ally in the war on terror. His Majesty has done and his services have done the world a service, a good service by bringing people to justice. And he is also making some incremental reforms. He will go at a pace slower than some would like to see; nevertheless, he's moving. And the question is, is there progress?

We live in a world where people expect things to happen overnight, and that's just not the way it works. I think it's going to be important for whoever is President to take

a long-term view of the ability of democracies to progress and, therefore, change.

I mentioned South Korea as an example of what I'm talking about. I'm sure—I suspect that if a President were having this conversation with a press corps in the sixties and seventies, they'd say, well, we're for democracy; therefore, how come you're not? How come it hadn't happened yet in South Korea? And yet it did eventually happen in South Korea.

The process and progress move at different paces and different places, and the role of the United States is to help encourage them along, while at the same time achieving certain national objectives. It just so happens that the key national objective in the beginning of the 21st century is to make sure we don't get attacked again and innocent people get murdered. And so we can do both. We can say that in the long run, the best way to secure your society is through liberty. In the short run, let's work collaboratively to protect ourselves.

Missile Defense System/Russia-U.S. Relations

Q. Can I go back on missile shields for a second?

The President. Yes.

Q. Vladimir Putin says that you're building a shield for weapons that don't exist now—

The President. Right.

Q. Doesn't he have a point? Do you see why he might be suspicious of that?

The President. Well, I would argue that it's best to anticipate what might happen and work to see that it doesn't happen, as opposed to not be prepared if it does happen. I mean, if somebody pops up with a weapon and says, "Hands up," people will say, well, how come we didn't have a shield? And so it's—I think we need to do both. I think we need to protect ourselves of what might happen and then work collaboratively to make sure it doesn't happen.

Q. On the missile defense system, if there's a misunderstanding between President Putin saying that this is a threat towards Russia and the U.S. saying it is not, what's more important, pushing the system through or maintaining a solid, good relationship with Russia, especially since he's leaving office?

The President. I think it's important to make sure we have a system to protect ourselves against the threats of the 21st century, the true threats. And that would be the threat of rogue regimes using a weapon of mass destruction to either blackmail and/or attack allies and friends; cells moving through our societies with the intent upon killing; radical forces undermining young democracies. Those are the threats, and therefore, we need to address them.

And I will continue to work with President Putin, Vladimir Putin, to explain to him that this is not aimed at him. And there's all kinds of ways you can do that. One is total transparency between our militaries and scientists—military people and scientists, which I'm more than happy to do.

President Vladimir Putin of Russia

Q. Do you see this as hurting the relationship between you and President Putin?

The President. No. As I said, it's a complex relationship. We've had issues before. I think if you look at the history of our relationship, there's been some moments where we've agreed and moments where we disagreed. That's just the way—that's what happens when you've got nations that are influential.

And we've had our disagreements with different allies, had disagreements with France over Iraq. We've had disagreements with other nations, but that doesn't mean they're not friends, or that doesn't mean we can't work with them.

Yes, sir.

Russia-U.S. Relations

Q. Are you at all concerned, though, that this current state of the relationship between you and President Putin might have some implications for the outcome with regard to Iran? You've sort of relied on his——

The President. Well, we've been working very closely with Russia on Iran, and I don't think that this—first of all, my comments yesterday were very realistic in the sense that said, we're friends; we've got a complex relationship; we can work together, but we've had some disagreements. I just don't see how—why that, those kinds of statements are going to prevent the United States and Rus-

sia from working closely together on key issues like Iran or proliferation, areas where we can get along.

Obviously, there's disagreement. You mentioned Kosovo. No question, he doesn't agree with our position. And so we've got to work together and see if we can't understand each other on a lot of issues. But it's an interesting question about, well, shouldn't you just scrap the system? And the answer is, is that the system exists in the first place to deal with threats. And that's why it needs to go forward.

Situation in Sudan/United Nations

Q. Can I ask about Darfur?

The President. Yes.

Q. Have you expressed your frustration with why the international community hasn't been moving on Darfur? You obviously introduced sanctions. Would you be prepared to see a no-fly zone over Darfur to have some direct interaction?

The President. We would consider that. And, yes, I've expressed my frustrations.

Q. You would consider it in what context? Would you want to see other people help establish——

The President. Look, I want to see other people helping Darfur and—by joining us and sending clearer and stronger messages to President Bashir. And yeah, I'm frustrated. It—because there are still people suffering, and yet the U.N. process is moving at a snail's pace. As you know, I gave this speech at the Holocaust Museum and caveated it because the Secretary-General asked for a reasonable period of time to see if he could not get the process moving.

Q. And the reasonable period is over?

The President. Yes, it was. That's why I gave my speech. And I don't know if you noticed, but Sudan is now headed to peace-keeping at the U.N.

Trial of I. Lewis Libby

Q. Sir, will you pardon Scooter Libby?

Q. [Inaudible]

The President. It's interesting, isn't it? And the second in charge is Iran.

Q. And a no-fly zone, have you——

The President. I can't give you all the tactics on it yet, but I understand the principle

and said so in my speech that we would consider such.

Listen, that was a sad day for—yesterday was a very sad day for Scooter and his family. But there's an ongoing process, and it wouldn't be appropriate for me to discuss it until the process has run its course.

Q. Do you think it says something about you and Vice President Cheney, that you continue to embrace a man who has been convicted and sentenced?

The President. No, it's a sad day for him, and my heart goes out to his family. And it wouldn't be appropriate for me to discuss the case until after the legal remedies have run its course.

Q. Well, there's a lot of speculation that you are going to pardon—

The President. Terry [Terence Hunt, Associated Press].

Russia-U.S. Relations

Q. Back to Russia?

The President. Yes, back to Russia. [Laughter]

Q. Fun stuff. [Laughter]

Q. Nice going, Terry. [Laughter]

Q. Yeah, right. [Laughter]

Q. You seemed to have carefully calibrated your response to some of the comments that you made—

The President. Well, I think what you ought to do—look, I would suggest going back and looking at a series of my responses. In other words, put—and yesterday was an important speech to give about democracies. And I think in terms—if you want to really figure out how I conduct relations with Russia, it would be helpful for you—if you're interested in writing a genuinely—I know you are—an in-depth piece about how I've conducted relations with Russia to look at different comments I have made relative to different moments of drama or moments of discord or moments of agreement.

And I have always said that, one, this is an important relationship. It's an important relationship because when we work together, we can solve problems. I've also said it's a complex relationship because there are disagreements. You asked why—I haven't had a chance to talk to him about it. The insinuation was that he's doing this for internal po-

litical reasons. I can't make that the case. And it would be unfair for me to put words in his mouth, and so, therefore, I won't.

I've also said it's important for there to be a personal relationship between me and President Putin so that we can have frank discussions in a way that enables us to more likely deal with the problems we face. That's why I'll visit with him here, and that's why I'm looking forward to welcoming him to my dad's house in Kennebunkport. It's an opportunity to continue to have a serious dialog with serious players in trying to keep the peace.

There will be disagreements. That's just the way life works. And—but that doesn't necessarily lend itself to speculation that somehow the relationship between me and the President is not a positive relationship. It is a positive—and I'm going to work to keep it that way.

There are some who say we shouldn't have any relations with Russia. I strongly disagree with that. I think it's important for us to maintain relations with Russia and—on a variety of fronts, whether it be—you know, look, I want him to join the WTO for a reason. I believe it's—I think if trade increases between Russia and the United States, it's important to have some structure and ways to resolve the inevitable disagreements that will arise. And that's what happens not only with a nation like Russia; that's what happens all the time in Europe. There's trade disputes where there needs to be a dispute resolution mechanism. And that's one of the things that the WTO provides.

Yes, sir.

Russia/Energy Resources

Q. You talked about the need to prevent extremists from getting their hands on oil in the Middle East or anywhere else. How would you characterize how Vladimir Putin manages his country's energy resources?

The President. Well, first of all, he is—he has got the opportunity to really develop the greatest asset of Russia, and that's her brain power. He's inherited a very difficult situation in Russia. The demographics indicate that it will be a shrinking society for a variety of reasons. One, it's health care system is good in parts of the country and not

so good in other parts. They've got a needle issue—they've got HIV/AIDS issues. They've got a series of issues that he knows he has to deal with. They've got an old pensioner system. So that cashflow from oil will enable him to modernize his society, and he's making steps to do that.

Secondly, it is a—obviously, it creates tensions with Europe. His being a sole source of natural gas for certain countries creates a degree of tension. And that's why the European Union and Russia are continuing to work through their issues.

The fundamental question is, will he make enough investment in his oil infrastructure to take advantage of these cashflows and, at the same time, make an investment inside his country? And he believes he is committed, enhancing human capital. The question is, is that—is the middle class going to continue to grow? It looks like it has grown substantially in the past.

This country, again, is certainly not perfect in the eyes of many Americans. On the other hand, if you consider where it's come from, it has made substantial progress toward a freer society in the sense that there is a middle class that's growing and will eventually make more demands. Now, having said that, there's been—as I said yesterday, there's been some backtracking. We had expectations, and those expectations weren't met.

Progress in Iraq

Q. Can I ask about Iraq? The idea of the surge seemed to be to buy some time for the political leaders in Iraq to make progress on reconciliation. Have you seen any real, meaningful progress on that front?

The President. Yes, look, they're close to getting an oil deal done. It's—it hadn't been the closure on certain issues, but they're working hard to get it there.

Q. Is that—I mean, they've been talking about that for a long time. It doesn't seem that they—the increased security operations have moved them to speed—

The President. Well, I think on certain fronts, they have made progress. They've got a budget that's now moved out. They've got a—I know they're working on an oil law. They're working on different—discussing whether or not they have Provincial elec-

tions, and we hope they get—hope these issues come to fruition.

But you're right, that's what the surge is intended to do, plus provide enough time for these Iraqi forces to step in, prevent the sectarian violence from spilling out of the capital. What's difficult is the fact that Al Qaida continues to kill. And it frustrates the Iraqi people, and it should frighten the American people that Al Qaida is active in Iraq looking for a safe haven from which to launch further attacks. And they're the primary—they're the ones primarily responsible for these EID [IED]* and suicide bombers.

Alternative Fuel Sources

Q. Can I go back to Brendan's [Brendan Murray, Bloomberg News] question for a second?

The President. What was it?

Q. About Russia's economic situation and the use of its oil wells. I guess my question is, are you concerned that Russia's enormous energy wealth is going to kind of create a situation where its leaders are vulnerable to the arrogance of power? In other words, they've got an immense amount of wealth concentrated in their hands, and inevitably that tends to make people act in aggressive ways, doesn't it?

The President. I think what—one reason why I promote rule of law throughout the world is to make sure that that very scenario doesn't accelerate. A second initiative that we all have got to take is to diversify away from hydrocarbons, and that's what will eventually yield to national security and economic security for countries that are dependent upon hydrocarbons from other places, such as ourselves.

You know, there is—there are mechanisms in place to basically enable nations to protect themselves. The EU is a mechanism. If you noticed, there's constant jockeying here in Europe with Russia about security. No question, some nations are concerned about their supplies of gas being used for political purposes. And therefore, all of us need to work collaboratively to convince nations not to do that, whether it be Russia or any other nation that is supplying hydrocarbons to the world.

* White House correction.

You've heard me say, we import oil from places that don't necessarily like us. Oil is fungible, by the way. But nevertheless, we do. And therefore, it is in our interest, just like it's in the interest of other countries, to diversify. And that's really going to be the interesting challenge here as we move forward in this 21st century. One of the dividends of diversification through new technologies is better environmental quality. And that's why this issue is—it's got a real poignancy, as far as I'm concerned. One, I know we can be better stewards of the environment. But also, at the same time, it ends up making us less dependent on crude oil from overseas, in our case.

It's coming, and the question is, how do you stimulate new technologies? What is the most effective way to get technologies to the market that will enable the world to control greenhouse gases, for example? And that's really where the—see, once you get people to agree to a goal, then the next question that needs to be answered is, how best to achieve that goal? We've taken the lead in achieving that goal by spending billions of dollars on new technologies.

We've got new technologies being advanced in cellulosic ethanol. That will help nations once that becomes able to compete in the market. There's new battery technologies being promoted, primarily out of Japan. But nevertheless, it's—will have the beneficial effect of enabling people to drive without the use of gasoline. Clean coal technologies are going to be a really important part of a strategy to deal with what will be an international goal.

And so the question is, how best to stimulate that type of investment? And that's an important discussion to have here at the G-8. It's also an important discussion to have at home.

Iran

Q. Iran—President Ahmadi-nejad says that Iran's nuclear program cannot be stopped. Is he right?

The President. Therefore, let's build a missile defense system. And, yes, we're going to work to stop him. That's why we are constantly working through diplomatic channels to continue to apply pressure. And I men-

tioned the other day, I think we need to go back to the U.N. Security Council. And we'll see.

Spread of Democracy

Q. You mentioned South Korea earlier. Do you think South Korea could be a model for Iraq?

The President. I think that—first of all, the situation inside South Korea is different—or was different than it is in Iraq. On the other hand, U.S. presence enabled the South Korean economy and system to evolve and, at the same time, provided assurances to the Chinese and the Japanese.

And you hear me say that—and compare the situation in the Middle East to what happened in the Far East. It's not to say that the cultures were the same or the difficulties in the different countries are the same. It is to say, however, that the U.S. can provide a presence in order to give people confidence necessary to make decisions that will enable democracies to emerge and say to other people, step back and let the democracies emerge.

It's very interesting to note that the U.S. presence in the Far East was welcomed by different countries with different interests. But it helped achieve an objective for all of us, and today, the Far East is peaceful. And it wasn't peaceful at the end of the Korean war. It was a place where thousands of Americans had lost lives.

And so the comparison between Korea and the Middle East is, again, not to say that the religious situation was the same—of course, it was different—nor to say that some of the influential players were the same—it's different. But it is to say that given time, these democracies will emerge.

President Nicolas Sarkozy of France

Q. What do you think of the new French President?

The President. I haven't met him yet—I have met him, excuse me, but not as President.

NOTE: The interview began at 11:45 a.m. at the Kempinski Grand Hotel Heiligendamm. In his remarks, the President referred to Secretary of Defense Robert M. Gates; President Pervez Musharraf of Pakistan; King Abdallah bin Abd al-

Aziz Al Saud of Saudi Arabia; President Umar Hassan Ahmad al-Bashir of Sudan; Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon of the United Nations; and President Mahmud Ahmadi-nejad of Iran. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this interview.

Remarks Following Discussions With Chancellor Angela Merkel of Germany in Heiligendamm

June 6, 2007

Chancellor Merkel. Ladies and gentlemen, this was our first meeting here during the G-8 meeting with the President of the United States of America. And we wanted to use this meeting in order to prepare the agenda of all of the issues that we're going to discuss here during the summit meeting. And it was a very satisfactory meeting, indeed, although in some areas there remain a few things here and there that we still need to discuss.

But what we would like to see coming out from this G-8 summit is, we would like to send a signal as to how we wish to shape globalization in the sense that we would like to give it a human face; we would like to shape it for human beings. We want to combat poverty. We want to ensure the freedom of investments. We want to also see to it that globalization respects the social dimension. We want to work on world trade issues. And there are a number of international conflicts that we wish to concentrate on and that we hope we will together be able to contain.

There are two priority issues that loom large on the agenda and could be seen and be also in the preparatory phase leading up to this meeting. The first one is climate change, and the second one, combating poverty in Africa. And on these two issues, we just had a very intensive and a very good conversation, a very good debate. As I said, there are few areas here and there we will continue to work on, but I trust that we will work out joint positions on that.

So let me say yet again, I do hope and trust that a very strong message will come out of this summit meeting, and we started here on a very good footing, indeed.

President Bush. Angela, thank you for your hospitality. You picked a beautiful site.

I'm appreciative of your leadership. I think that when people take an objective look at what's been accomplished here, people see that there's been major progress made on key issues. I come with a deep desire to make sure that those suffering from HIV/AIDS on the continent of Africa know that they'll get help from the G-8. I come with a deep desire to work with people around the table to reduce malaria on the continent of Africa and feed the hungry—I know you share that desire as well. Thank you for your leadership.

I also come with a strong desire to work with you on a post-Kyoto agreement about how we can achieve major objectives. One, of course, is the reduction of greenhouse gases. Another is to become more energy independent—in our case, from crude oil from parts of the world where we've got some friends and sometimes we don't have friends. We have a good chance to share our technologies with the developing world to make sure that we're good stewards of the environment. And I thank you for your leadership on this issue, and I'm looking forward to working with our fellow G-8 members.

It's good to be back in this part of the world. I know it takes a lot of hard work to put on one of these G-8s, and your team has done a fine job. Glad to be with you.

Thank you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at approximately 2:25 p.m. at the Kempinski Grand Hotel Heiligendamm. Chancellor Merkel spoke in German, and her remarks were translated by an interpreter. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks Following Discussions With Prime Minister Shinzo Abe of Japan in Heiligendamm

June 6, 2007

President Bush. It's good to be with a friend, Shinzo Abe. We recently met at Camp David, and now we have a—we were on the phone since then, and now we have a chance to further our discussions.

We talked about a lot of subjects. Particularly, we talked about North Korea. There is a common message here, and that is, we

expect the North Koreans to honor agreements. And it's very important for the Japanese people to know that I strongly support Shinzo Abe's desire to deal with this very important issue of—the abduction issue.

Likewise, we had an extensive discussion about energy and climate change. I reminded the Prime Minister that his great country and great economy is going to lead the way when it comes—along with the United States, in leading the way coming to develop technologies that will enable us to be—change our energy habits and, at the same time, be good stewards of the environment. And we discussed ways to develop a framework that has the flexibility and, at the same time, the goals so we can encourage the world to move in that direction.

It's good to be with a friend.

Prime Minister Abe. This is the sixth time that I'm having discussions with George, and as we always do, this time we were able to have a very frank exchange of views on many things. On North Korea, unfortunately, the North Koreans have not done anything to implement the initial actions. And also on the issue of abduction, they have not taken any sincere actions to resolve that issue. So we agreed that the G-8 leaders need to send a strong message to North Korea on these issues. And also on the abduction issue, I explained the Japanese position to George once again, and I was able to gain his understanding on this issue, as he has always shown understanding.

On climate change, I explained the Japanese proposal to the President, and we agreed that Japan and the United States would be working together for the creation of an effective framework which is flexible, and that we would be cooperating to achieve that end in the future.

We reconfirmed the fact that the alliance we have between Japan and the United States in dealing with issues like North Korea and climate change is truly an alliance for Asia and an alliance for the entire world, for that matter.

President Bush. Thank you, sir. Thank you all very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:29 p.m. at the Kempinski Grand Hotel Heiligendamm. Prime Minister Abe spoke in Japanese, and his remarks

were translated by an interpreter. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks Following Discussions With Prime Minister Tony Blair of the United Kingdom and an Exchange With Reporters in Heiligendamm

June 7, 2007

Prime Minister Blair. Well, obviously, this is a summit where we'll be discussing two crucial issues. One is the change in the climate and the actions that we need to take in order to address that. And I think this is a very substantial coming together around the need to make sure that we have a substantial reduction in emissions and find the right process and the right way that we can achieve that.

And I think with the President's speech last week, this has moved the situation on a great deal. I think there is a real desire to come together. I think everyone wants to be part of a post-Kyoto deal. Everyone wants to try and make sure that that is a deal that's got to be—that includes all the major emitters. And everyone wants to make sure that that deal can then command broad agreement right across the international community and deliver what people want to see, both for reasons of the environment and for reasons of energy security.

However, I think both myself and the President are very concerned, as well, to make sure that we do not simply focus on climate change. We've also got to focus on recommitting ourselves to the Gleneagles process on Africa, on making major steps forward there in relation to things like HIV/AIDS and education. In addition to that, of course, there's the situation in Darfur, where we both are anxious that there is strong action taken. And then we've also managed to have a word, too, about the world trade talks, which we want to see reach a successful conclusion.

So, I mean, there's still obviously a lot of talking and discussing going on, and we're about to go in for the main session now. But I do feel, myself, that people are coming together, and I think that's important.

President Bush. Good start there.

Prime Minister Blair. Thank you.

President Bush. You know, we had a press conference in the Rose Garden where, you know, it was the last time on U.S. soil I'll be standing next to the Prime Minister talking about what we believe and how our efforts are going to lead to peace and to a better world for a lot of people. This is the last meeting I will have had with him as Prime Minister. It's a nostalgic moment for me. I'm sorry it's come to be, but that's what happens in life. We'll move on.

Tony said we talked about global climate change. I told him in Washington, and I re-committed myself today, that the United States will be actively involved, if not taking the lead, in a post-Kyoto framework, post-Kyoto agreement. I view our role as a bridge between people in Europe and others and India and China. And if you want them at the table, it's important to give them an opportunity to set an international goal. And that's why I laid out the initiative I laid out. And I told Tony that we're deadly earnest in getting something done; this is serious business. And the fundamental question is, how best to send proper signals to create the technologies necessary to deal with this issue?

And as we discuss global climate change, it's really important we don't forget those who are dying. And I appreciate this man's commitment to global AIDS—fighting global AIDS. We do that ourselves—laid out a \$30 billion initiative. I'm very proud of the United States citizens for supporting such an initiative. Over the past 3 years, antiretroviral drugs has been extended from—to over a million people, up from 50,000. So it's important to debate the environment and discuss it. It's also important for those of us who have got the wealth to put it to use to save lives. The malaria initiative we talked about is a really important initiative, and I hope that countries here at the G-8 join Great Britain and the United States in saving lives that can be saved in a pretty easy way. It just takes will, focus, and effort.

We did discuss Darfur. I'm frustrated, but the international organizations can't move quickly enough. I don't know how long it's going to take for people to hear the call to

save lives. I will be stressing, along with Tony, the need for nations to take action. If the U.N. won't act, we need to take action ourselves, and I laid out a series of sanctions that I think, hopefully, will affect Bashir's behavior. But enough is enough in Darfur.

We talked about Doha. We're committed to doing a deal in Doha. If you're interested in alleviating poverty around the world, then they ought to be joining and making the necessary concessions to have a global trading system that helps affect the poor.

So I've come with a broad agenda and a serious agenda, and so has the Prime Minister. And it's been a good, meaningful discussion, as usual. We'll answer one question apiece, then we've got to go get our picture taken.

United Kingdom-Saudi Arabia Relations/ International Cooperation on the Environment

Q. Mr. President, you've said it's important to set an international goal. How long does the world have to wait for America to set a goal that others can measure of how much you're cutting greenhouse gasses by?

And Prime Minister, if I could ask you about another matter. Were you aware that your Government was approving payments to a friend of President Bush's as part of British Aerospace's kickback system, and is that why you suspended a fraud inquiry?

President Bush. Glad you're answering that question—[laughter]—a friend of mine. [Laughter]

Prime Minister Blair. On the point you asked me—let me make one thing very clear: I'm not going to comment on the individual allegations. And a lot of this, of course, relates to things that go back to the 1980s.

But let me just make one thing very, very clear to you: This investigation, if it had gone ahead, would have involved the most serious allegations and investigations being made of the Saudi royal family. And my job is to give advice as to whether that is a sensible thing, in circumstances where I don't believe the investigation—[inaudible]—would have led anywhere, except to the complete wreckage of a vital strategic relationship for our country in terms of fighting terrorism, in terms of the Middle East, in terms of British interests

there. Quite apart from the fact that we would have lost thousands—thousands—of British jobs.

So I totally understand why you guys have got to do your job, but I've got to do mine. And mine is sometimes taking these decisions about what I believe to be in the strategic interests of our country and holding to it. And that's what I've done.

President Bush. Greenhouse gases declined last year in the United States, in spite of the fact that our economy grew. Not many countries can make that claim. In other words, we're taking steps necessary to be good stewards of the environment, at the same time, advance technologies. Our record is a strong record. We've spent billions of dollars on technologies necessary to make us less dependent on foreign sources of oil and, at the same time, good stewards of the environment.

Secondly, as I proposed, that by the end of 2008, the world's emitters of greenhouse gases should come together and set an international goal. Nothing is going to happen in terms of substantial reductions unless China and India are participating. And so it is our role to serve as a bridge between people who have got one point of view about how to solve greenhouse gases and about how to get the developing nations such as China and India to the table.

In the meantime, we'll move forward with a very aggressive agenda. I don't know if you followed my speeches in the United States, but I said, we'll reduce gasoline usage by 20 percent over the next 10 years. And the way you do that is through technologies and ethanols and battery technologies, and I'm convinced we'll meet that goal. And in so doing, we'll be, yet again, a world leader when it comes to new technologies.

Jennifer [Jennifer Loven, Associated Press].

Missile Defense System/Russia-U.S. Relations

Q. Thanks. Last night, the Russians said again—Putin's spokesman said again that everything they've heard from you and from your staff about missile defense has left them unconvinced. Is there—what can you say to President Putin today that's maybe different

or more specific than what we've heard so far that might change his mind?

President Bush. Well, I mean, the—I'm looking forward to my meeting with Vladimir Putin. A missile defense system cannot stop multiple launch regimes. In other words, the facts are, is that—the fact is this: that you can't stop two, three, four, five missiles. And therefore, I will explain to him once again that a missile defense system is aimed at a rogue regime that may try to hold Russia and/or Europe and the United States hostage. I think the best thing for me to do is just talk about the facts.

Secondly, it is important for Russia and Russians to understand that I believe the cold war ended, that Russia is not an enemy of the United States, that there's a lot of areas where we can work together—for example, in Iran or areas of proliferation. There's a lot of constructive work we can do.

And so I'm looking forward to my dialog with Vladimir Putin this afternoon. It's hopefully an attempt to find other areas where we can work together and make sure our rhetoric doesn't cause concern in our respective countries and here in Europe. He can be—he doesn't have to be viewed as an enemy, see. And the missile defense system should say, we can work together. I actually think that Russia ought to participate with us. If it's aimed at dealing with a rogue regime, then it makes sense for Russia to say, "Let's join; let's share technologies."

And so I will reiterate the proposal we made, and that's, send your generals to the United States, send your scientists to the United States, and we'll share our vision. And hopefully that will help. Hopefully the visit this afternoon will make it clear that we have no animosity, we bear no ill will. We're simply trying to deal with the true threats of the 21st century. And I repeat, Russia is not a threat. They're not a military threat. They're not something that we ought to be hyperventilating about. What we ought to be doing is figuring out ways to work together.

Thank you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at approximately 9:26 a.m. at the Kempinski Grand Hotel Heiligendamm. In his remarks, he referred to President Umar Hassan Ahmad al-Bashir of Sudan; and President Vladimir Putin of Russia.

A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks Following Discussions With President Vladimir Putin of Russia and an Exchange With Reporters in Heiligendamm

June 7, 2007

President Bush. Vladimir and I just had a very constructive dialog, particularly about missile defense. He expressed his concerns to me. He is concerned that the missile defense system is not an act that a friend would do. He made some interesting suggestions. As a result of our discussions, we both agreed to have a strategic dialog, a opportunity to share ideas and concerns between our State Department, Defense Department, and military people.

This will be a serious set of strategic discussions. This is a serious issue, and we want to make sure that we all understand each other's positions very clearly. As a result of these conversations, I expect there to be better understanding of the technologies involved and the opportunities to work together.

I told Vladimir we're looking forward to having him up to my folks' place in Maine the beginning of July. And we'll be able to continue our discussions, our bilateral discussions on a variety of issues.

President Putin. I'd like to confirm what the President of the United States has just said—except for one thing. I have not said that friends do not act in this way. [Laughter] We have an understanding as well as common threats, but we have differences. The difference is ways and means in which we can overcome these threats. We considered the proposal by the American side very thoroughly, and we have ideas of our own. I have stated these ideas in a thorough way.

The first proposal is to use the radar station rented by us in Azerbaijan which is entitled Gabala. Yesterday I had a conversation of this matter with the President of Azerbaijan. The existing agreement with Azerbaijan makes it possible for us to do this, and the President of Azerbaijan stressed that he will be only glad to contribute to the cause of global security and stability.

We can do it automatically, in an automatic regime. And in this case, the system which is to be constructed can cover not only part of Europe but the entire Europe without any exception. This will fully exclude the possibility for the missile debris to fall on European states because they will fall in the ocean. This will make it possible for us not to change our stance on targeting our missiles. On the contrary, this will create necessary grounds for common work.

But this work should be multifaceted with the engagement of states concerned in Europe. And we agreed with George that our experts will start doing it as soon as possible. This will make it impossible—unnecessary for us to place our offensive complexes along the borders with Europe. And this will make unnecessary to place the appropriate American complexes in outer space.

But we hope that these consultations will not serve as cover—to cover some unilateral actions, and I have told George about that. Because as soon as a country, for instance, Iran, carries out its first test of its long-range missile, our reconnaissance means and American reconnaissance means will register this immediately. Three to five years will be necessary from the first test until the system is operational. This time is fairly enough to deploy any ABM system. Therefore, no matter how long our talks are going on, we will never be late. The major thing for these negotiations is that they should be viewed and should take into account joint interests in the security area.

I'm grateful to the President of the United States for a constructive dialog today.

President Bush. We'll answer one question apiece. Toby [Tabassum Zakaria, Reuters]. Then we got to go to a meeting.

Missile Defense System

Q. President Putin, are you saying now that you do not consider the missile defense issue a serious threat to your country anymore? And were you satisfied with what President Bush presented to you in this meeting?

President Putin. I think that if we work together to overcome the threats we are discussing today and if we take into account the concerns of each other, if we make this work

transparent and if we provide for an equal access to the system, then we'll have—through the management of this system—then we will have no problem. And I'm, of course, satisfied with the spirit of openness in which we discussed this problem today on behalf of President of the United States.

Russia-U.S. Relations

Q. My question is for both Presidents. In your today's dialog, what was more, constructive things or rather differences? What prevailed?

President Bush. Well, you just heard that, the desire to work together to allay people's fears. There's a lot of people who don't like it when Russia and the United States argue, and it creates tensions. Russia is a great country, and so is the United States. It's much better to work together than it is to create tensions.

Thanks. See you later.

NOTE: The President spoke at 4:07 p.m. at the Kempinski Grand Hotel Heiligendamm. President Putin referred to President Ilham Aliyev of Azerbaijan. President Putin spoke in Russian, and his remarks were translated by an interpreter. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Statement on House of Representatives Action on Stem Cell Research Legislation

June 7, 2007

Today the United States House of Representatives, with its vote on the embryonic stem cell bill, chose to discard existing protections on human life. This bill puts scientific research and ethical principle into conflict, rather than supporting a balanced approach that advances scientific and medical frontiers without violating moral principles.

My administration has sought to understand the dilemmas of stem cell research not as a choice between science and ethics but as a challenge to advance medicine while meeting our solemn obligation to defend human life. That is why in 2001, I authorized the first Federal funding for research on embryonic stem cells, under careful safeguards.

This policy encouraged ethical research, while requiring taxpayer funds not be used to support the creation, destruction, or harming of living human embryos.

Recent scientific developments have reinforced my conviction that stem cell science can progress in ethical ways. Researchers have been investigating innovative techniques that could allow doctors and scientists to produce stem cells just as versatile as those derived from human embryos but without harming life, and the House vote on this bill took place just after significant advances in stem cell research were reported in leading scientific journals. These reports give us added hope that we may one day enjoy the potential benefits of embryonic stem cells without destroying human life.

I am disappointed the leadership of Congress recycled an old bill that would simply overturn our country's carefully balanced policy on embryonic stem cell research. If this bill were to become law, American taxpayers would, for the first time in our history, be compelled to support the deliberate destruction of human embryos. Crossing that line would be a grave mistake. For that reason, I will veto the bill passed today.

NOTE: The statement referred to S. 5.

Remarks Following Discussions With President Lech Kaczynski of Poland in Gdansk, Poland

June 8, 2007

President Kaczynski. Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. I would like to welcome everybody to the meeting between President Kaczynski and President Bush.

The talks have been longer than expected, yes. Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, we have had a longer meeting with President George W. Bush, and the subject of the conversation were the issues of interest to the United States of America and for Poland, our country.

Certainly we talked about the issue of missile defense system. We talked about problems pertaining to the relations with our very important Russian partner. We talked about the situation in Iran a little, also, a little about

the situation in Kosovo. But, of course, the main subject of talks were the two first issues.

I can tell you that as far as the missile defense system is concerned, the two parties fully agree. And this is in line with the obvious thing, that the system has no aggressive intentions. This is the plan which is to reinforce the protection of Europe against the dangers which result from the fact that not all the countries of the contemporary world are responsible—we do not mean Russia here. It's about other states.

As far as relations with our Russian partner are concerned, well, we agree that Russia is an important country in the world and that the status of Russia, which is very extensive territorially and is also very numerous in terms of population, and it has nuclear capability, which is the legacy from the previous period—that all these factors give Russia basis for being a country important in the world, a country which really is very important. And the United States and Poland do not question that situation.

However, it is important that our Russian partner, with which Poland wants also to have as good relations as possible—the United States has good relations with that country—but that Russia should recognize that the world has changed for the last 18 years, and it concerns also Central and Eastern Europe, and in particular, it concerns our country.

No plans of the United States, as the U.S. President said, or Polish plans are directed against the interests of the Russian Federation. The Russian Federation can feel totally safe, at least from the respective of our countries, although there are some other larger states—large states in the world, and some other entities are responsible for those states. However, the whole plan of the missile defense system is the plan which gives rights to more stability and defense, defense which is needed to guard against irresponsible actions, without any additional objectives here.

However, as far as other uses are concerned which were subjects to our talk, I introduced what I know about the issues related to the Western Balkans because it is known that not long ago, there was a meeting in Brussels, where I talked with almost all the leaders of the western Balkan States. We

talked also about Kosovo, the crucial problem there. We talked also about how, in Polish opinion, the solution pertaining to that region, formerly the part of Serbia—however, in reality, it is a separate identity—and how the relations pertaining to that region can be really reflected on other parts of the world.

We also talked about the stabilizing role of NATO today and I hope that tomorrow, to an even larger extent. We also talked a little about the European Union. We talked about the states with which the United States is befriended and Poland is befriended—for example, the German Federal Republic. We also exchanged views on France. President George W. Bush had already had a chance to talk longer with President Sarkozy during the meeting of G-8, and I had only a brief encounter with him 2 years ago when I was not President yet. But in 2 days' time, I'm going to meet him.

The conversation which we have had, very interesting, important for myself at least. I'm sure it will be followed up another meeting in mid-July. And then we will come to concrete results. The beginning of that was the meeting today, very fruitful for myself. And I want to thank you very much, Mr. President, for coming to Poland. Thank you. Thank you very much.

And now, President George W. Bush.

President Bush. Mr. President, thank you for your gracious hospitality. Laura and I are so honored to be with you and Mrs. Kaczynska. I think probably the highlight was to meet your granddaughter, and congratulations on the birth of another granddaughter.

This is our third trip to Poland. We have never been in this beautiful part of your country, and it's spectacular. We really thank you for inviting us to Jurata. Thank you for the walk in the woods, and thank you for the very friendly and important dialog we had.

The President talked a lot about what we talked about. One thing I do want to do is praise this good country for being so strong for freedom. I love to be in a land where people value liberty and are willing to help others realize the blessings of liberty. Kosciuszko is a statue right across the street from the White House, on which it says, "For

our freedom and yours.” Isn’t that interesting—for our freedom and somebody else’s. Poland is a great advocate for democracy in the world today.

And I thank you, Mr. President, for your leadership in the cause of freedom. You’re very much involved in the cause of freedom in two very difficult theaters: Afghanistan and Iraq. I thank you and I thank the people of Poland for the sacrifices they made so that others may live in a free society. You’ve deployed nearly 900 troops in Iraq, troops that are helping the Iraqi people defend their young democracy against extremists, radicals who murder in the name of an ideology to deny people the right to live in a free society. And I thank you for the leadership. I appreciate the fact that you’ve made the decision to extend the deployment through 2007. That is a bold and hard decision, I know. The people of Iraq will never forget it.

And it’s important for those families who have lost a loved one in the Iraq theater to understand, the American people won’t forget it either. And we send our prayers and blessings to those families.

Recently in Afghanistan, there was a call for more NATO help, and this Government stepped up quickly by sending more troops to help that young democracy survive as well. So, Mr. President, thank you for your leadership. It’s a proud moment in history when free countries are able to help others.

That’s how you set the stage for peace. Free societies don’t war with each other. That’s why Europe is now whole, free, and at peace. Our dream is, the same blessings of liberty be extended to the Middle East. I thank you for your stalwart support.

We discussed, as well, the efforts by Poland to help people who are—need to be free from governments that are—darken their vision. I thank you very much for your leadership for Belarus, the people of Belarus, a nation where peaceful protesters are beaten and opposition leaders are disappeared.

I appreciate so very much your speaking out on behalf of the dissidents in Cuba—an island right off our coast, as you know, Mr. President. And it is inspiring for the people of Cuba who want to live in a free society

to hear the voices from Europe, such as yours or the Czech Republic’s.

We had a—spent a lot of time talking about the Ukraine. I thank you for your insight. And then, of course, we did talk about missile defense, a subject that the President and I spent a lot of time talking about. It’s a subject I spent a lot of time talking about with President Putin yesterday.

First, let me say, I appreciate the support of the deployment of the missile defense interceptors here in Poland. We will negotiate a fair agreement that enhances the security of Poland and the security of the entire continent against rogue regimes who might be willing to try to blackmail free nations. That’s the true threat of the 21st century. It’s a subject that I told you I discussed with President Putin.

I have made clear what you just made clear, Mr. President: The system we have proposed is not directed at Russia. Indeed, we would welcome Russian cooperation on missile defense. We think it makes sense to have a—and I proposed and he accepted a working group from our State Department, Defense Department, and military to discuss different opportunities and different options, all aimed at providing protection for people from rogue regimes who might be in a position to either blackmail and/or attack those of us who live in free societies.

All in all, we had the kind of conversation you’d expect strong allies to have. It was candid; it was over a really good meal. And I’m looking forward to bringing you back, Mr. President, to the White House. I can’t wait to see you there in mid-July. Again, thank you all for your wonderful hospitality. God bless the people of Poland.

NOTE: The President spoke at approximately 8:22 p.m. at Gdansk Lech Walesa International Airport. In his remarks, he referred to President Vladimir Putin of Russia. President Kaczynski referred to President Nicolas Sarkozy of France. President Kaczynski spoke in Polish, and his remarks were translated by an interpreter. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

The President's Radio Address

June 8, 2007

Good morning. This week I am traveling in Europe, where I am meeting with world leaders to discuss ways to address challenges like climate change, to work together to combat diseases like malaria and HIV/AIDS, and help advance freedom throughout the world.

Back at home, America is engaged in an important discussion about immigration. Most Americans agree that the 1986 immigration law failed. It failed because it did not secure our border, it did not include tough worksite enforcement, it did not help people assimilate, and it encouraged more people to come here illegally. Today, illegal immigration is supported by criminal enterprises dedicated to document forgery, human trafficking, and labor exploitation. This is unacceptable, and we need to fix it in a way that honors our finest traditions.

People have strong feelings on this issue. I believe we can express our feelings, disagree on certain elements, and still come together on a solution. We can accomplish that through the bipartisan Senate bill. It is based on months of negotiation. The result is legislation that puts border security first, establishes a temporary-worker program to meet the legitimate needs of our growing economy, sets up a mandatory system for verifying employment eligibility, and resolves the status of the estimated 12 million people who are here illegally. If this bill becomes law, America will finally have in place a system that addresses all these problems and can be adjusted to address future problems that may arise.

I understand the skepticism some Members of Congress have regarding certain aspects of this legislation. Like any legislation, this bill is not perfect. And like many Senators, I believe the bill will need to be further improved along the way before it becomes law. In the heat of the debate, critics and supporters can sometimes talk past each other, so I want to speak to Members about some of the concerns I have heard.

I know some of you doubt that the Federal Government will make good on the border security and enforcement commitments in this bill. My administration is determined to

learn from the mistakes of the past decades. And that is why we are now committing more resources than ever before to border security, doubling the number of Border Patrol agents, building hundreds of miles of fencing, and employing advanced technology, from infrared sensors to unmanned aerial vehicles. The bill builds on this progress by requiring that we meet border security objectives before certain other provisions can take effect.

This bill also addresses other problems with the 1986 reform. Unlike the 1986 law, this bill includes a temporary-worker program to ensure that those who come here to work do so in a legal and orderly way. Unlike the 1986 law, this bill gives honest employers the tools they need to ensure that they are hiring legal workers, beginning with a tamper-resistant identity card. Businesses that knowingly hire illegal aliens will be punished. Workers who come here illegally will be sent home. And unlike the 1986 law, this bill does not grant amnesty for those who are already here.

Amnesty is forgiveness with no penalty for people who have broken our laws to get here. In contrast, this bill requires illegal workers to pay a fine, register with the Government, undergo background checks, pay their back taxes, and hold a steady job. And if at the end of 8 years they want to apply for a green card, they will have to pay an additional substantial fine, show they have learned English, and return to their home country so they can apply from there. In short, they will have to prove themselves worthy of this great land.

I also want to say a word to those in Congress concerned about family unification. This bill will create a merit-based point system that recognizes the importance of family ties by granting points to some applicants who have family members here legally. More than half of new green cards will go to family members. Immigrants will be allowed to bring in their spouses and minor children, and we will clear the backlog for millions of people who have been waiting patiently in line.

Securing the border and upholding family values are not partisan concerns; they are important to all Americans. They must be addressed, and this bill is the best way to do

it. I urge Senator Reid to act quickly to bring this bill back to the Senate floor for a vote, and I urge Senators from both parties to support it. The immigration debate has divided too many Americans. By coming together, we can build an immigration system worthy of this great Nation, one that keeps us safe and prosperous, welcomes dreamers and doers from across the globe, and trusts in our country's genius for making us all Americans, one nation under God.

Thank you for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 7:30 a.m. on June 8 in Heiligendamm, Germany, for broadcast at 10:06 a.m., e.d.t., on June 9. The transcript was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary on June 8. The Office of the Press Secretary also released a Spanish language transcript of this address.

Digest of Other White House Announcements

The following list includes the President's public schedule and other items of general interest announced by the Office of the Press Secretary and not included elsewhere in this issue.

June 2

In the morning, the President had an intelligence briefing.

June 4

In the morning, the President had an intelligence briefing. Later, he and Mrs. Bush traveled to Prague, Czech Republic, arriving in the evening. While en route aboard Air Force One, he had a telephone conversation with Parliament Member Saad Hariri of Lebanon.

Later in the evening, the President and Mrs. Bush traveled to the Hilton Atrium Hotel Prague.

June 5

In the morning, the President had an intelligence briefing. Later, in the Grand Ballroom of the Hilton Atrium Hotel Prague, he and Mrs. Bush met with U.S. Embassy staff and their families.

Later in the morning, the President and Mrs. Bush traveled to Prague Castle, where, on the First Courtyard, they participated in an arrival ceremony with President Vaclav Klaus of the Czech Republic and his wife, Livia Klausova. Then, in the Hapsburg Salon, they participated in a photo opportunity and met with President Klaus and Mrs. Klausova.

In the afternoon, in Rudolph's Gallery, the President and Mrs. Bush participated in a social luncheon with President Klaus and Mrs. Klausova. He then returned to the Hilton Atrium Hotel Prague.

Later in the afternoon, the President met with Social Democratic Party leader Jiri Paroubek of the Czech Republic. He and Mrs. Bush then traveled to Czernin Palace. Later, in the Music Salon, they met with democracy advocates.

In the evening, the President and Mrs. Bush traveled to Rostock, Germany. While en route aboard Air Force One, he was informed of the sentence handed down in the trial of former Chief of Staff to the Vice President I. Lewis "Scooter" Libby.

Later in the evening, the President and Mrs. Bush traveled to Heiligendamm, Germany, where, upon arrival, they went to the Kempinski Grand Hotel Heiligendamm.

The President announced his designation of the following individuals as members of the Presidential delegation to attend the inauguration of Amadou Toumani Toure as President of Mali on June 8: Mike Johanns (head of delegation); Josephine K. Olsen; Morgan W. Davis; Mary Beth Leonard; Steven Phillips; and Judy Van Rest.

June 6

In the morning, the President had an intelligence briefing.

In the afternoon, the President had lunch with Chancellor Angela Merkel of Germany.

In the evening, the President and Mrs. Bush met with musicians and activists Bono, Sir Robert Geldof, and Youssou N'Dour. Later, they traveled to Hohen Luckow, Germany. They then went to the Gut Hohen Luckow estate, where they attended a reception, entertainment, and a dinner for G-8 leaders and their spouses hosted by Chancellor Merkel and her husband, Joachim Sauer.

Later in the evening, the President and Mrs. Bush returned to the Kempinski Grand Hotel Heiligendamm in Heiligendamm, Germany.

The President announced that he has nominated Douglas A. Brook to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Financial Management).

The President announced that he has nominated Mark Green to be Ambassador to Tanzania.

The President announced that he has nominated David W. Hagy to be Director of the National Institute of Justice at the Department of Justice.

The President announced that he has nominated Wanda L. Nesbitt to be Ambassador to Cote d'Ivoire.

The President announced that he has appointed Kenneth B. Mehlman as a member of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council.

The President declared a major disaster in Nebraska and ordered Federal aid to supplement State and local recovery efforts in the area struck by severe storms, flooding, and tornadoes on May 4–19.

June 7

In the morning, the President had an intelligence briefing. Later, he had a breakfast meeting with Prime Minister Tony Blair of the United Kingdom. He then participated in G–8 summit meetings.

Later in the morning, the President participated in the G–8 summit official photograph. He then met with Junior 8 student leaders.

In the afternoon, the President had a working lunch with G–8 leaders. He then participated in G–8 summit meetings.

In the evening, the President attended a reception for G–8 leaders. He then had a working dinner with G–8 leaders.

Later in the evening, the President and Mrs. Bush had after dinner coffee with G–8 leaders.

The White House announced that the President will welcome President Nguyen Minh Triet of Vietnam to the White House on June 22.

June 8

In the morning, the President had an intelligence briefing. Later, he met with President Nicolas Sarkozy of France.

Later in the morning, the President met with President Hu Jintao of China. He then participated in G–8 summit meetings with outreach country representatives.

In the afternoon, the President participated in a photo opportunity with outreach country representatives. He then had a working lunch with G–8 leaders, Africa outreach representatives, and outreach country representatives.

Later in the afternoon, the President and Mrs. Bush traveled to Gdansk, Poland, where, at the Gdansk Lech Walesa International Airport, they were greeted by President Lech Kaczynski of Poland and his wife, Maria Kaczynska. Later, he and Mrs. Bush traveled to the Presidential Retreat in Jurata Hel, Poland, where they participated in an arrival ceremony with President Kaczynski and Mrs. Kaczynska. He then met with President Kaczynski. Later, he had a working dinner with President Kaczynski.

In the evening, the President and Mrs. Bush returned to Gdansk Lech Walesa International Airport. Later, they traveled to Rome, Italy, where, upon arrival, they went to the Villa Taverna.

The President announced his intention to nominate Thomas J. Barrett to be Deputy Secretary of Transportation.

The President announced that he has named J. Michael Farren as Deputy Assistant to the President and Deputy Counsel to the President.

The President announced that he has named William Burck as Deputy Assistant to the President and Special Counsel to the President.

The President announced that he has named Emmet Flood as Deputy Assistant to the President and Special Counsel to the President.

The President announced that he has named Scott Coffina as Associate Counsel to the President.

The President announced that he has named Amy F. Dunathan as Associate Counsel to the President.

The President announced that he has named Francis Q. Hoang as Associate Counsel to the President.

The President announced that he has named Al Lambert as Associate Counsel to the President.

The President announced that he has named Michael Purpura as Associate Counsel to the President.

The President announced that he has named Kate Todd as Associate Counsel to the President.

The President declared a major disaster in Oklahoma and ordered Federal aid to supplement State and local recovery efforts in the area struck by severe storms, tornadoes, and flooding on May 4–11.

Nominations Submitted to the Senate

The following list does not include promotions of members of the Uniformed Services, nominations to the Service Academies, or nominations of Foreign Service officers.

Submitted June 4

James L. Caswell,
of Idaho, to be Director of the Bureau of Land Management, vice Kathleen Burton Clarke, resigned.

William John Garvelink,
of Michigan, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

J. Christian Kennedy,
of Indiana, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of Counselor, for the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service as Special Envoy for Holocaust Issues.

David H. McCormick,
of Pennsylvania, to be an Under Secretary of the Treasury, vice Timothy D. Adams.

Roderick W. Moore,
of Rhode Island, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Montenegro.

Ronald Jay Tenpas,
of Maryland, to be an Assistant Attorney General, vice Sue Ellen Wooldridge.

Withdrawn June 4

Bruce P. Jackson,
of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the U.S. Institute of Peace for a term expiring January 19, 2011, vice Chester A. Crocker, term expired, which was sent to the Senate on March 12, 2007.

Submitted June 5

Douglas A. Brook,
of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Navy, vice Richard Greco, Jr., resigned.

Mark Green,
of Wisconsin, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the United Republic of Tanzania.

David W. Hagy,
of Texas, to be Director of the National Institute of Justice, vice Sarah V. Hart, resigned.

Wanda L. Nesbitt,
of Pennsylvania, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Cote d'Ivoire.

Withdrawn June 5

Henry Bonilla,
of Texas, to be Permanent Representative of the United States of America to the Organization of American States, with the rank of Ambassador, vice John F. Maisto, resigned, which was sent to the Senate on March 15, 2007.

Checklist of White House Press Releases

The following list contains releases of the Office of the Press Secretary that are neither printed as items nor covered by entries in the Digest of Other White House Announcements.

Released June 4

Transcript of a press gaggle by National Security Adviser Stephen J. Hadley, Deputy National Security Adviser for International Economic Affairs David H. McCormick, and Deputy Press Secretary Dana Perino

Released June 5

Transcript of a press gaggle by Deputy Press Secretary Dana Perino

Fact sheet: Advancing Freedom and Democracy Around the World

Advance text of the President's remarks in Prague, Czech Republic

Released June 6

Transcript of a press briefing by Council on Environmental Quality Chairman James L. Connaughton and Assistant Secretary of State for Economic, Energy, and Business Affairs Daniel S. Sullivan

Transcript of a teleconference press briefing by National Security Adviser Stephen J. Hadley on the G-8 summit

Transcript of a teleconference press briefing by Council of Economic Advisers Chairman Edward P. Lazear

Statement by the Press Secretary on disaster assistance to Nebraska

Released June 7

Transcript of a teleconference press briefing by Deputy National Security Adviser for

International Economic Affairs David H. McCormick

Transcript of a teleconference press briefing by National Security Adviser Stephen J. Hadley on the G-8 summit

Transcript of a press gaggle by National Security Adviser Stephen J. Hadley on the G-8 summit

Statement by the Deputy Press Secretary: Visit of Vietnamese President Nguyen Minh Triet

Released June 8

Transcript of a press gaggle by Deputy Press Secretary Dana Perino

Transcripts of press gaggles by Counselor to the President Daniel J. Bartlett on the G-8 summit

Statement by the Deputy Press Secretary on disaster assistance to Oklahoma

Fact sheet: The President's Achievements at the G-8 Summit, Heiligendamm, Germany

Fact sheet: Best of the Immigration Fact Check: Top 10 Common Myths

Fact sheet: A Record of Commitment to Africa: U.S. Plans To Substantially Increase Resources for Fight Against Global HIV/AIDS

Acts Approved by the President

NOTE: No acts approved by the President were received by the Office of the Federal Register during the period covered by this issue.